

PATENT

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a Final Office action dated September 11, 2003. Claims 1-38 were examined. Claims 1, 7, 24, 28, and 36 have been amended.

Examiner Telephone Interview Summary

Applicant thanks both the supervisory examiner and the examiner for taking the time for the examiner interview conducted on December 10, 2003. The participants of the interview included Gilberto Barron, Cas Stulberger, David O'Brien, and Steven Gilliam. Applicant discussed claim 1 of the patent application with the examiners. Applicant provided arguments expressing the absence in the art of record of credential types, trust levels, and credentials as claimed. Applicant also discussed proposed amendments to emphasize such absence in the art of record. No agreement was reached with respect to allowability of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1 – 14, 17 – 25, and 27 – 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,275,941 B1, granted to Saito, et al. (the Saito reference). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 24, 28, and 36 to more clearly recite “plural trust levels,” as requested by Examiner Barron.

The Saito reference at least does not suggest or disclose “each of the plural trust levels corresponding to a respective set of credential types...mapping rule establishing a correspondence between the sufficient trust level and the respective set of credential types therefor” as in claim 1. Nothing in Saito or any of the art of record discloses or suggests a correspondence between each of plural trust levels and a set of credential types. Furthermore, Saito does not disclose or suggest a mapping rule as in claim 1 that establishes correspondence between a trust level and its set of corresponding credential types.

The Saito reference at least does not suggest or disclose “an encoding of correspondence between trust levels and credential types, wherein each of the trust levels corresponds to a respective set of the credential types...selection logic for selecting in

PATENT

accordance with the encoding, a credential type corresponding to the trust level...and requesting and receiving a **credential of the selected credential type**" as in claim 7, "in an environment that provides plural trust levels...associating credential types with respective ones of the trust levels" as in claim 24, "in a networked information environment that provides plural trust levels...selecting from plural credential types, a credential type having an associated trust level commensurate with the first trust level requirement; and obtaining a **credential of the selected credential type**" as in claim 28, and "associating credential types with trust levels, wherein each of the trust levels correspond to a respective set of the credential typesobtaining at least one credential...wherein the obtained at least one credential is of one of the credential types associated with the required one of the trust levels" as in claim 36. Saito never suggests or discloses selecting a credential type that corresponds to a trust level, and then requesting and receiving (or obtaining) a credential of the selected credential type.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's independent claims, and those that depend therefrom are allowable over the Saito reference and any other art of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)


The Office Action rejects claims 15 and 16 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Saito reference in view of U.S. Patent 5,610,981, granted to Mooney, et al. (the Mooney reference). The Office Action also rejects claim 26 under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Saito reference in view of the publication WO 98/25373, listing an inventor Glogau (the Glogau reference). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections.

The dependent claims 15, 16, and 26 depend on corresponding ones of the above allowable independent claims and are allowable at least for the reasons explained above. Moreover, all of the dependent claims 2 - 6, 8 - 23, 25 - 27, 29 - 35, and 37 - 38 are dependent on one of the above allowable independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that all of the dependent claims are allowable.

PATENT

Conclusion

In summary, claims 1 - 38 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/>	deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.
	12/11/03 Date

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6320
(512) 338-6301 (fax)

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____